

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/090,142	MIYAZAWA, IKUYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lynne Edmondson	1725	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lynne Edmondson. (3) _____.

(2) Linda Saltiel. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 November 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nakatsuka et al. (US 2003/0034381 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A translation of the foreign priority document has been filed thereby overcoming the Nakatsuka rejection. The amendments to the device claims overcome the previously cited rejections over Elliott and Deambrosio.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required